

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraphs have been amended on pages 2-8, 13, and 14.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-24 were pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 13, 15-18, and 21 are currently being amended. Claim 12 is canceled. Thus, claims 1-11 and 13-24 remain under consideration.

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Scott et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,675,752, in view of Davis et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,969,716. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

As set forth in the background of the invention section of Applicant's specification, the claimed invention relates to a scenario editing device for editing a scenario of multimedia contents. Such a scenario defines the form of presenting or exhibiting multimedia contents, such as the displaying portion and timing of text, images and audio or video that is being reproduced. While conventional scenario editing devices are known that permit editing of a scenario in response to instructions from an operator, the invention facilitates automatic supplementing of incomplete multimedia contents without the need for additional instructions from the operator.

Independent claim 1 is drawn to a scenario editing device which includes, among other elements, "a scenario rule memory for memorizing a scenario basic rule which defines specifications of a *complete state of the multimedia contents*." It further recites "a receiving unit for receiving an additional data set which represents additional material necessary to complete the multimedia content." Finally, it recites "a scenario supplementing unit . . . for

supplementing the scenario according to the scenario basic rule so that the additional material is included in the multimedia contents to make the multimedia contents approach the complete state.” Independent claim 9 (as amended) and independent claim 17 include similar features.

In the claimed invention, the basic rule defines what would constitute specifications, such as timing or displaying, of a particular set of multimedia contents that would then be complete once the multimedia contents are received. The receiving unit is to receive additional multimedia content and the supplemental unit is to then supplement the scenario i.e., the current state of the presentation of the multimedia contents so that they further approach what has been defined as a complete state.

Scott is drawn to an interactive applications generator for generator an interactive environment for use on a single server in a multi-client network system. While Scott discloses several editors, including a screen template editor, it is not seen that Scott discloses any elements that store a basic rule defining a complete state of multimedia contents. In the absence of this element, it is not surprising that, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Scott also fails to disclose any receiving unit for receiving additional multimedia content. Scott then also fails to disclose a scenario supplementing unit connected to the scenario rule memory and scenario receiving unit so that additional material (received with the receiving unit) is included in the multimedia contents to make them approach the complete state.

In regard to the scenario rule memory recited in claim 1, the Office Action refers to column 10, lines 50-65 and column 14, lines 5-8. The former, however, merely describes an interactive presentation editor that is used to link menus and application screens to create an interactive environment. As noted by Scott, the interactive presentation editor permits the operator to organize and display screens in a screen hierarchy. In other words, this aspect of Scott's disclosure is used to create the environment; it does not store definitions for a complete state of multimedia environment.

It is also not seen that column 14, lines 5-8 also do not disclose the scenario rule memory recited in claim 1. This portion of Scott's disclosure relates to a screen identifier

movement operation performed with the interactive presentation editor. As explained in column 13, line 62 and following, a GUI illustrates a change in hierarchical environment obtained using the interactive presentation editor and corresponding changes made to audio, video and games application screens. It is not seen that this discloses a memory for memorizing a scenario basic rule which defines specifications of a complete state of the multimedia contents.

In view of these deficiencies in Scott's teachings, it is also clear that Scott fails also to disclose any "receiving unit" as set forth in claim 1. In regard to this feature, the Office Action asserts that it Davis shows this feature clearly at column 3, lines 1-20 and column 9, lines 55-68. The Office Action asserts that one would have been motivated to modify Scott's device in view of Davis in order "to fill out the space in a content faster as taught by Davis et al."

The cited portion of Davis at column 3, lines 1-20 refers to media parsers that are used to process media content. It discloses, for example, discloses accelerating, decelerating or modifying a soundtrack to fit a video sequence. The cited portion at column 9, lines 55-68 refers to electronic transmission and distribution of information necessary to reproduce a new media production based upon original media input signals. It is not seen that Davis provides a teaching or suggestion, however, to receive and store such information and automatically supplement a scenario according to a scenario basic rule defining specifications of a complete state of multimedia contents. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action relies on an improper use of hindsight.

In summary, it is submitted that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness based on Scott and Davis, and that the invention of claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable over those references.

The dependent claims incorporate the features of the respective independent claims from which they depend and are patentable for the foregoing reasons. The dependent claims set forth additional features that render them patentable over the cited prior art.

For example, claims 5, 13, and 21 recite an scenario analyzing unit for analyzing the scenario memorized in the scenario rule memory to produce a "lacking data list," which is exhibited or presented. In regard to these features, the Office Action refers to column 13, line 48 to column 14, line 55 and Figs. 5-7B. That description, however, relates to a screen identifier movement operation using the interactive presentation editor; a "zoom function"; and a "zoom" command. It is not seen or understood that Scott tracks "lacking data" or exhibits such data.

Claims 6, 14 and 22 depend respectively from claims 5, 13, and 21. They recite structure that memorizes the lacking data list as completion degree information and renewing the completion degree information whenever an additional data set is received. In regard to these features, the Office Action contends that "while Scott shows the converting unit, Davis teaches the scenario analyzing unit renews scenario completion degree information whenever said receiving unit receives the additional data set (column 8, lines 35-55 and column 9, lines 10-30)." It is respectfully submitted, however, that the cited portions of Davis lack any reference to or suggestion of completion degree information. It is also respectfully submitted that the Office Action again engages in an improper use of hindsight reasoning in suggesting that Davis would somehow suggest modification of Scott to yield the combination of features recited in claims 6, 14, and 22. Clarification of the specific aspect of Davis being relied upon and their alleged relation to Scott is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to

Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11/25/03

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5407  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By David A. Blumenthal *RN 38072*  
for David A. Blumenthal  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 26,257